REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated September 7, 2004. Claims 22-27 are pending in the application. Applicants have amended Claim 22 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Hudetz et al.*, *Ogasawara* and *Simonoff et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has noted that the aspect of *Hudetz* and *Ogasawara* that is missing is the unique ID that is associated with a message packet. However, the Examiner also should note that it is not just a unique ID that is associated with a message packet that is missing; rather, it is the combination of a unique input device ID and the unique value, which are both sent to a relational database and the relational database is operable to store an association between the two. Therefore, there must exist the Boolean AND operation with respect to this combination. For example, if a UPC code were scanned by one input device, this would connect to one location and if the same UPC were scanned by another input device, then it would be routed to a different location. The reason is that the combination of the two ID's, the UPC code and the permanently affixed code, would provide an overall unique code. Thus, this is what *Hudetz* and *Ogasawara* fail to disclose.

The *Simonoff* reference is a reference that merely describes the inclusion of an ID number which is a unique 8-digit integer. The purpose of this ID number is to guarantee a unique value that identifies the "logical socket connection" between the server host and the client host that is running a Universal Client device. This is described at Column 11, Lines 15-23. As such, there is no suggestion that this Client ID should be combined with a different value to provide an overall unique value. Further, nothing in either of these references describe that it is the input device ID that is permanently affixed thereto that, when combined with the scanned codes, provides a unique identifier that can be stored in a relational database for the purpose of looking up a routing address. As such, Applicant believes that neither *Hudetz*, *Ogasawara* or *Simonoff*, taken singularly or in combination, render Applicant's present

inventive concept, as defined by the amended claims, obvious or unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 22-27.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,913 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Gregory M. Howison
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/yoc/cr

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
December 7, 2004